

REMARKS

The Applicant appreciates the time taken by the Examiner to review the Applicant's present application. This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Official Action mailed January 23, 2012 ("Office Action").

Examiner interviews

On March 15, 2012, attorneys Schuster and Berrier conducted a telephone interview with the Examiner. During the March 15, 2012 interview, the invention was discussed with particular reference to the example embodiment shown in Figure 3. The Applicant subsequently submitted a proposed amendment to claim 26. Another interview was conducted on April 19, 2012, in which the invention was discussed in relation to Figure 3 generally, and in relation to the proposed amendment of claim 26 in particular. No specific agreement was reached.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 and Interview Summary dated March 19, 2012

The Examiner rejects claims 26-45 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 20020184610 ("Chong") in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 20020138582 ("Chandra"). The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

With respect to the Examiner's interpretation of the invention, the Applicant notes that the interpretation expressed in the Office Action was incorrect in several respects, such as characterizing the invention as a means to deliver service and device specific applications to end users, and stating that a developer selects non-presentation based options from a master template. After the March 15, 2012 interview, the Examiner's interview summary appeared to correct some of these misunderstandings, but still incorrectly construed the invention as being driven by a user to generate a template for the user's presentation device. These issues were discussed with the Examiner in the April 18 interview, and it was pointed out that an application running on a computer examines the unformatted data corresponding to a specific service to identify name-value pairs in the unformatted data. Although a user may select ones of the identified name-value pairs to be retained, it is the application that identifies name-value pairs in the unformatted data, the application that selects building block from the master template based on the identified name-value pairs, and the application that generates service/device-specific templates.

The Applicant points out that the claims have been amended to emphasize that an application which is running on a computer receives or retrieves the unformatted data and examines this data to identify name-value pairs in the data. This application further selects building blocks from the master template, based on the identified name-value pairs, and still further assembles the selected building blocks into the service/device-specific templates. The only involvement of a user, in embodiments as claimed, is providing input which serves as the basis for retaining a set of the identified name-value pairs. The Applicant also points out that the claims have been amended to explicitly state that the master template does not convert unformatted data into formatted data

The system of Chong, on the other hand, provides an integrated development environment (IDE) in which building blocks can be dragged and dropped to create workflow-based applications (par. 0257 et seq.). The selection of these building blocks is performed by a user at his discretion, rather than by an application based on identified name-value pairs. The building blocks are visual representations of workflow states (par. 0259) and do not format any name-value pairs, particularly name-value pairs identified in unformatted data for a service. Chong employs content primitives (“user interface widgets”; par. 0310 et seq.) that can be used to display text, images, etc., but these are not contained in a master template, nor does each primitive format a single corresponding name-value pair.

The Applicant therefore respectfully submits that the claimed invention is distinct from Chong in at least the following respects:

- Chong does not teach examining unformatted data, but instead teaches (par. 0298) that information is presented to a user via the GUI of the IDE (the Examiner cites Figure 17 of Chong, in which name-value pairs are derived from the building blocks of the IDE, and Figure 6-13, pages 41-42 of PA, in which XML items are stored – not examined);
- Chong does not teach identifying name-value pairs in unformatted data, but instead teaches (par. 0372) that name-value pairs are presented to the user within the GUI of the IDE – since the name-value pairs are being viewed through the GUI, they must be formatted for presentation through the GUI;
- Chong does not teach that building blocks are selected by an application from a master template based on identified name-value pairs, but instead teaches the reverse – the building blocks in the IDE are selected by a user, then name-value pairs associated with the building blocks are presented to a user (par. 0372);

- 10 -

- Chong does not assemble building blocks into templates that generate formatting for the name-value pairs, but instead assembles building blocks into a diagram of an interaction flow (par. 0257).

The Applicant notes that the Examiner does not contend that Chandra teaches the limitations discussed above. Consequently, the combination of Chong and Chandra fails to teach these limitations.

In addition to the foregoing arguments, the Applicant respectfully reasserts the arguments previously set forth in this case. For at least these reasons, the Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Chong and Chandra fails to render the claimed invention obvious as required by M.P.E.P. 2143. The Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103 be withdrawn, and that the claims be allowed.

* * * * *

- 11 -

Conclusion

The Applicant has now made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. Other than as explicitly set forth above, this reply does not include any acquiescence to statements, assertions, assumptions, conclusions, or any combination thereof in the Office Action. For the foregoing reasons and for other reasons clearly apparent, the Applicant respectfully requests full allowance of all Claims. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number listed below for prompt action in the event any issues remain.

The Director of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 50-3183 of Sprinkle IP Law Group.

Respectfully submitted,

Sprinkle IP Law Group
Attorneys for Applicant



Katharina W. Schuster
Reg. No. 50,000

Date: April 23, 2012

1301 W. 25th Street, Suite 408
Austin, TX 78705
Tel. (512) 637-9220
Fax. (512) 371-9088